

REMARKS

These remarks are responsive to the Final Office Action mailed October 14, 2009 ("Action"). Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-12, 17-22, 25-29, 31-35, 38, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP Patent EP 0917355 A1 to Szucs et al. in view of WO Publication 02/11328 to Ikeda et al. The Action asserts that US Patent 7,475,418 is a certified translation of WO Publication 02/11328.

Claims 13, 14, 16, 23, 30, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs and Ikeda, in further view of US Patent 6,401,242 to Eyer et al.

Claims 15 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs, Ikeda, and Eyer, in further view of US Patent 5,671,219 to Jensen et al.

Claims 24, 37 and 41-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs and Ikeda, in further view of US Patent 6,965,770 to Walsh et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

The combination of Ikeda and Szucs, even if proper, does not disclose a method including the claim 1 features of "splitting, by a processor, the at least one service information table into sub-tables, wherein each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream, and wherein said certain transport stream comprises a local transport stream of a certain cell."

To reject claim 1, the Action concedes that:

Szucs meets all the limitations of the claim except "splitting the at least one service information table into sub-tables, wherein each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream, and wherein said certain transport stream comprises a local transport stream of a certain cell."

See Action, p. 4. To remedy this deficiency, the Action alleges that:

However, Ikeda discloses (col.8, lines 14-18) that the Network Information Table contains a link descriptor of a region, which describes information necessary for identifying the program provided, in the Service Information. Ikeda further discloses (col.9, lines 12-18; col.10, lines 28-33) that each service area includes service ID for their areas as represented in Fig. 8.

Id. Applicants respectfully disagree that Ikeda remedies the deficiency in Szucs.

Notably, the cited lines of Ikeda do not disclose “wherein each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream, and wherein said certain transport stream comprises a local transport stream of a certain cell,” as claimed. At column 8 lines 14-18, Ikeda discloses that a “NIT contains a link descriptor in a region to be used for describing information necessary for identifying the service provided in response to a request of a receiver for additional information relating to any specific item described in the SI (service information).” Emphasis added. These lines merely indicate that Ikeda’s receiver separately requests and receives the “additional information.” This means that Ikeda’s additional information is not directly available in a table. Because the “additional information” has to be separately requested, Ikeda’s “information necessary for identifying the service” does not include a local transport stream. Claim 1, in contrast, recites “wherein each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream, and wherein said certain transport stream comprises a local transport stream of a certain cell.” Thus, the combination of Ikeda and Szucs fails to disclose the claimed “splitting” or “local transport stream.”

Moreover, the combination of Ikeda and Szucs, even if proper, does not disclose a method including the claim 1 features of “establishing a mother table configured to maintain a sub-table of the certain transport stream and sub-tables of adjacent transport streams of the certain transport stream, wherein said adjacent transport streams comprise transport streams of at least one neighboring cell of said certain cell.”

The instant application provides examples of mother tables that are used to solve a technical problem. In paragraph 35, for example, the instant application describes

“a method and an arrangement for defining a sub-table structure for SI tables, which may be used to split one big Service Information (SI) table into several

smaller tables. Advantageously in broadcast transmission, the splitting into the smaller sub-tables (Sub-Ts) requires less transmitted bandwidth because all the SI do not need to be broadcast to a End User Terminal (EUT). Also, the sub-table division enables relatively easy creation of local SI tables because sub-tables can serve as a basis for local Transport Stream (TS) announcement. By dividing tables into smaller ones, the amount of unnecessary information transmitted for the EUT is reduced. The TSs of an entire broadcast network can be divided. Moreover, neighboring, or adjacent, TSs (cells) can announce and advertise their content to each other, and further to the EUT.”

See US 2006/01560366. The claimed mother table, however, cannot be considered as obvious since neither of the cited references disclose nor refer to anything similar.

To reject the claimed mother table, the Action again relies on Ikeda. In maintaining the rejection of the claimed mother table, the Action asserts:

Ikeda discloses (col.9, lines 58-60; col.10, lines 28-33) that the NIT is made to describe information on the TS being transmitted in the original service area and the adjacent service areas as represented in Fig. 8. The rejection is maintained.

Id. at p. 2. The Action also asserts:

As to “establishing a mother table configured to maintain a sub-table of the certain transport stream and sub-tables of adjacent transport streams of the certain transport stream, wherein said adjacent transport streams comprise transport streams of at least one neighboring cell of said certain cell” Ikeda discloses (col.4, lines 57-63; col.7, lines 58-62; col.10, lines 28-33) that the link information is generated that shows the transport stream or a program being broadcast in the service area and the programs being broadcast in adjacent service areas as represented in Figs. 1 and 8.

See Action, p. 4-5. Applicants respectfully disagree.

None of these cited lines of Ikeda disclose a mother table configured to maintain subtables in the manner claimed. For instance, at the cited lines of column 4, Ikeda merely discusses a “transport stream with link information showing link between the transport stream, program or events being broadcast in its service area for terrestrial broadcasting and the

programs being broadcast for terrestrial broadcasting in adjacent service areas and the priorities of the various links.” At the cited lines of column 7, Ikeda merely discusses that “link information with which the transport stream produced from the transmitter 50 is provided is prepared in advance by the controller 57 of the transmitter 50” that that “link information prepared by the controller 57 is added to the transport stream by the multiplexer unit 54.” Lastly, at the cited lines of column 10, Ikeda merely discusses that “link information has a table structure” that “contains service area IDs for identifying the service areas adjacent to the original service area and service IDs for identifying the programs (services) to be linked in the respective adjacent service areas.” None of the cited lines, however, disclose “establishing a mother table configured to maintain a sub-table of the certain transport stream and sub-tables of adjacent transport streams of the certain transport stream, wherein said adjacent transport streams comprise transport streams of at least one neighboring cell of said certain cell,” as claimed.

Moreover it would not have been obvious to combine Szucs and Ikeda since Szucs relates to fixed wired home network connected by serial busses (*see* Szucs at Abstract and at ¶ 1-3), whereas Ikeda relates to digital broadcasting system having a transmitter and a receiver (*see* Ikeda at C1, L8-14). As such, Szucs and Ikeda relate to different technical environments and problems, and would not have been obvious to combine.

Accordingly, the combination of Szucs and Ikeda, even if proper, fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1 and hence does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants submit that each of claims 2-32 and 40-44 is allowable by reasons analogous to at least one of those given in support of claim 1, in addition based on further features recited by various ones of claims 2-32 and 40-44.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: March 9, 2010

By: /Christopher M. Swickhamer/
Christopher M. Swickhamer
Registration No. 59,853
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Fax: 312-463-5001